### 1

#### Global tech innovation high now.

Mercury News et al 6/4 [Mercury News and East Bay Times Editorial Boards, June 4, 2021, “Editorial: How America can Win the Global Tech War” <https://www.mercurynews.com/2021/06/04/editorial-why-silicon-valley-needs-endless-frontier-bill/> //gord0]

The nation that wins the global tech race will dominate the 21st century. This has been true since the 1800s. Given the rapid pace of innovation and tech’s impact on our economy and defense capabilities in the last decade, there is ample evidence to suggest that the need for investment in tech research and development has never been greater. China has been closing the tech gap in recent years by making bold investments in tech with the intent of overtaking the United States. This is a tech war we cannot afford to lose. It’s imperative that Congress pass the Endless Frontier Act and authorize the biggest R&D tech investment in the United States since the Apollo years. Rep. Ro Khanna, D-Santa Clara, made a massive increase in science and technology investment a major part of his platform while campaigning for a seat in Congress in 2016. Now the co-author of the 600-page legislation is on the cusp of pushing through a bipartisan effort that has been years in the making. Khanna and his co-authors, Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., Sen. Todd Young, R-Ind., and Rep. Mike Gallagher, R-Wisc., are shepherding the bill through the Senate, which is expected to approve it sometime later this month. That would set up a reconciliation debate between the House and Senate that would determine the bill’s final language. The ultimate size of the investment is still very much up in the air. Khanna would like Congress to authorize $100 billion over a five-year period for critical advancements in artificial intelligence, biotechnology, cybersecurity, semiconductors and other cutting-edge technologies. The Senate is talking of knocking that number down to $50 billion or $75 billion. They should be reminded of China Premier Li Keqiang’s March announcement that China would increase its research and development spending by an additional 7% per year between 2021 and 2025. The United States still outspends China in R&D, spending $612 billion on research and development in 2019, compared to China’s $514 billion. But the gap is narrowing. At the turn of the century, China was only spending $33 billion a year on R&D, while the United States was spending nearly 10 times that amount. The bill would authorize 10 technology hubs throughout the nation designed to help build the infrastructure, manufacturing facilities and workforce needed to help meet the nation’s tech goals. Building tech centers throughout the United States should also create more support for the industry across the country. Tech’s image has taken a beating in recent years — the emergence of the term “Big Tech” is hardly a positive development — and the industry will need all the support it can muster in Congress. The United States continues to have a crucial tech edge over its competitors, most notably China. The only way we can hope to win the 21st century is to make significant investments in research and development that will spark the next wave of innovation.

#### Violent strike efforts are increasing – they slow innovation, specifically in the tech sector.

Hanasoge 16 [Chaithra; Senior Research Analyst, Market Researcher, Consumer Insights, Strategy Consulting; “The Union Strikes: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly,” Supply Wisdom; April/June 2016 (Doesn’t specifically say but this is the most recent event is cites); https://www.supplywisdom.com/resources/the-union-strikes-the-good-the-bad-and-the-ugly/]//SJWen

The result: Verizon conceded to several of the workers’ demands including hiring union workers, protection against outsourcing of call-center jobs, and employee benefits such as salary hikes and higher pension contributions, among others and thus bringing an end to the strike in June.

The repercussion: The strike witnessed several instances of social disorder, violence and clashes, ultimately calling for third party intervention (Secretary of Labor – Thomas Perez) to initiate negotiations between the parties. Also, as a result of the strike, Verizon reported lower than expected revenues in the second quarter of 2016.

Trade unions/ labor unions aren’t just this millennia’s product and has been in vogue since times immemorial. Unions, to ensure fairness to the working class, have gone on strike for better working conditions and employee benefits since the industrial revolution and are as strong today as they were last century. With the advent of technology and advancement in artificial intelligence, machines are grabbing the jobs which were once the bastion of the humans. So, questions that arise here are, what relevance do unions have in today’s work scenario? And, are the strikes organized by them avoidable?

As long as the concept of labor exists and employees feel that they are not receiving their fair share of dues, unions will exist and thrive. Union protests in most cases cause work stoppages, and in certain cases, disruption of law and order. Like in March 2016, public servants at Federal Government departments across Australia went on a series of strikes over failed pay negotiations, disrupting operations of many government departments for a few days.  Besides such direct effects, there are many indirect effects as well such as strained employee relations, slower work processes, lesser productivity and unnecessary legal hassles.

Also, union strikes can never be taken too lightly as they have prompted major overturn of decisions, on a few occasions. Besides the Verizon incident that was a crucial example of this, nationwide strikes were witnessed in India in March and April this year when the national government introduced reforms related to the withdrawal regulations and interest rate of employee provident fund, terming it as ‘anti-working class’. This compelled the government to withhold the reform for further review. In France, strike against labor law reforms in May turned violent, resulting in riots and significant damage to property. The incident prompted the government to consider modifications to the proposed reforms.

However, aside from employee concerns, such incidents are also determined by a number of other factors such as the country’s political scenario, economy, size of the overall workforce and the unions, history of unionization, labor laws, and culture. For example, it is a popular saying that the French are always on strike as per tradition (although recent statistics indicate a decline in frequency). In a communist government like China, strikes have steadily risen in number. In 2015, China Labor Bulletin (CLB), a Hong Kong-based workers’ rights group recorded 2,700 incidents of strikes and protests, compared to 1,300 incidents in 2014. Most of them have stemmed out of failure by the government to respect the basic rights of employees and address labor concerns.

Interestingly, unions have not been able to gain a strong foothold in the IT-BPO industry. While many countries do have a separate union to represent workers from the sector, incidents of strikes like Verizon have been relatively low.  However, workplace regulations, in addition to other factors mentioned could be a trigger for such incidents, even if on a smaller scale. For example, a recent survey that interviewed several BPO employees in India revealed that while forming a union in the BPO sector was difficult, irksome workplace regulations such as constant surveillance, irregular timings and incentives have prompted employees to express their resentment in smaller ways such as corruption of internal servers and so on.  Such risks are further enhanced in a city like Kolkata, which carries a strong trade union culture.

#### Victories like the aff mobilizes unions in the IT sector.

Vynck et al 21 [Gerrit De; Carleton University, BA in Journalism and Global Politics, tech reporter for The Washington Post. He writes about Google and the algorithms that increasingly shape society. He previously covered tech for seven years at Bloomberg News; Nitashu Tiku; Columbia University, BA in English, New York University, MA in Journalism, Washington Post's tech culture reporter based in San Francisco; Macalester College, BA in English, Columbia University, MS in Journalism, reporter for The Washington Post who is focused on technology coverage in the Pacific Northwest; “Six things to know about the latest efforts to bring unions to Big Tech,” The Washington Post; https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/01/26/tech-unions-explainer/]//SJWen

In response to tech company crackdowns and lobbying, gig workers have shifted their strategy to emphasize building worker-led movements and increasing their ranks, rather than focusing on employment status as the primary goal, says Veena Dubal, a law professor at the University of California Hastings College of the Law in San Francisco. The hope is that with President Biden in the White House and an even split in the Senate, legislators will mobilize at the federal level, through the NLRA or bills such as the PRO Act, to recognize gig worker collectives as real unions.

#### Technological innovation solves every existential threat – which outweighs.

Matthews 18 Dylan. Co-founder of Vox, citing Nick Beckstead @ Rutgers University. 10-26-2018. "How to help people millions of years from now." Vox. https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good

If you care about improving human lives, you should overwhelmingly care about those quadrillions of lives rather than the comparatively small number of people alive today. The 7.6 billion people now living, after all, amount to less than 0.003 percent of the population that will live in the future. It’s reasonable to suggest that those quadrillions of future people have, accordingly, hundreds of thousands of times more moral weight than those of us living here today do. That’s the basic argument behind Nick Beckstead’s 2013 Rutgers philosophy dissertation, “On the overwhelming importance of shaping the far future.” It’s a glorious mindfuck of a thesis, not least because Beckstead shows very convincingly that this is a conclusion any plausible moral view would reach. It’s not just something that weird utilitarians have to deal with. And Beckstead, to his considerable credit, walks the walk on this. He works at the Open Philanthropy Project on grants relating to the far future and runs a charitable fund for donors who want to prioritize the far future. And arguments from him and others have turned “long-termism” into a very vibrant, important strand of the effective altruism community. But what does prioritizing the far future even mean? The most literal thing it could mean is preventing human extinction, to ensure that the species persists as long as possible. For the long-term-focused effective altruists I know, that typically means identifying concrete threats to humanity’s continued existence — like unfriendly artificial intelligence, or a pandemic, or global warming/out of control geoengineering — and engaging in activities to prevent that specific eventuality. But in a set of slides he made in 2013, Beckstead makes a compelling case that while that’s certainly part of what caring about the far future entails, approaches that address specific threats to humanity (which he calls “targeted” approaches to the far future) have to complement “broad” approaches, where instead of trying to predict what’s going to kill us all, you just generally try to keep civilization running as best it can, so that it is, as a whole, well-equipped to deal with potential extinction events in the future, not just in 2030 or 2040 but in 3500 or 95000 or even 37 million. In other words, caring about the far future doesn’t mean just paying attention to low-probability risks of total annihilation; it also means acting on pressing needs now. For example: We’re going to be better prepared to prevent extinction from AI or a supervirus or global warming if society as a whole makes a lot of scientific progress. And a significant bottleneck there is that the vast majority of humanity doesn’t get high-enough-quality education to engage in scientific research, if they want to, which reduces the odds that we have enough trained scientists to come up with the breakthroughs we need as a civilization to survive and thrive. So maybe one of the best things we can do for the far future is to improve school systems — here and now — to harness the group economist Raj Chetty calls “lost Einsteins” (potential innovators who are thwarted by poverty and inequality in rich countries) and, more importantly, the hundreds of millions of kids in developing countries dealing with even worse education systems than those in depressed communities in the rich world. What if living ethically for the far future means living ethically now? Beckstead mentions some other broad, or very broad, ideas (these are all his descriptions): Help make computers faster so that people everywhere can work more efficiently Change intellectual property law so that technological innovation can happen more quickly Advocate for open borders so that people from poorly governed countries can move to better-governed countries and be more productive Meta-research: improve incentives and norms in academic work to better advance human knowledge Improve education Advocate for political party X to make future people have values more like political party X ”If you look at these areas (economic growth and technological progress, access to information, individual capability, social coordination, motives) a lot of everyday good works contribute,” Beckstead writes. “An implication of this is that a lot of everyday good works are good from a broad perspective, even though hardly anyone thinks explicitly in terms of far future standards.” Look at those examples again: It’s just a list of what normal altruistically motivated people, not effective altruism folks, generally do. Charities in the US love talking about the lost opportunities for innovation that poverty creates. Lots of smart people who want to make a difference become scientists, or try to work as teachers or on improving education policy, and lord knows there are plenty of people who become political party operatives out of a conviction that the moral consequences of the party’s platform are good. All of which is to say: Maybe effective altruists aren’t that special, or at least maybe we don’t have access to that many specific and weird conclusions about how best to help the world. If the far future is what matters, and generally trying to make the world work better is among the best ways to help the far future, then effective altruism just becomes plain ol’ do-goodery.

### CP

#### CP Text: A just government should recognize an unconditional right to strike except for healthcare workers

#### Physicians must use legal means and philosophy to solve any issues concerning strike.

**Maware 11** [Mawere, M. (2011). Are physicians’ strikes ever morally justifiable? A call for a return to tradition. Pan African Medical Journal, 6(1). doi:10.4314/pamj.v6i1.69081 // LEX JB]

* Article written in the context of philosophy
* Preserve virtue
* African communalism

One of the concerns of **philosophers** of medicine/medical ethicists has been to **reflect on the rights, entitlements and obligation of physicians in relation to patients and members of the public**. Scientists such as physicians inclined to dealing with factual judgments have failed to convincingly address the issue of strike using the ‘old version’ of the Hippocratic Oath which is the bedrock of the medical profession the world over. **Whilst the argument from African communalism** are philosophically plausible as **has been demonstrated by this work**, it is paramount **to reiterate that the question of physician strike is too complex to be epitomized in a word**. While there are shades of truth in each of the arguments raised in the prior discussion, they are all debatable. One can still argue that physician strikes are morally justifiable since physicians are people with families who need to be financially supported and cared for. Nevertheless, **I remain supremely confident that physicians strike is always morally unjustifiable. Like Plato in The Republic, and like Aristotle, Aquinas and Dewey, I believe that physicians should through practice, by example, and by the study of ethics learn what it is to be a good physician qua physician, and to practice and value the virtues requisite for good medicine as I have spelled them out in this paper**. If any problem, **physicians should negotiate peacefully through their associations, courts of law, patients committees, moralists, academics and other stakeholders without contravening the virtues of medicine**. They should **convince the government or responsible authority for their salaries and conditions of services by arguments and not strike as the latter is detrimental not only to the government/responsible authority, but to patients and members of the public**. It is therefore the contention of this paper that to argue that **physicians strike is morally unjustifiable is not to say that physicians have no moral rights and entitlements. They** do **have** as they are also human **beings who feel, desire and need to be loved and respected by their fellow comrades. However, if problems arise with the employer these should be resolved amicably without losing the essential values of medicine by harming the society** (which they are part). In fact, even if it means the revision of medicine’s past to meet its future, this should be done without sacrificing their (physicians) traditional ethical values and causing harm to the patients and the public. By staging a strike the **medical fraternity, thus, loses legitimacy and public confidence**. After all, when striking the real people who suffer most are the patients and the public, and not the government or the body responsible for their plights and grievances. Physicians are indeed called to work for the people and strikes shrink their professional latitude and diminish them as professionals; hence the need to go back to tradition.

#### Nurse unionization and strikes destroy community hospitals and significantly reduce the quality of care – they’re just a business ploy and not even represented by actual nurses – that causes hospitals closing which means people can’t have access to healthcare – that causes misrecognition

Burke 20 [Alene Burke et al 20, master of science in nursing, registered nurse, 3/1/20, “Do Unions Benefit or Harm Healthcare & Nursing Industries?”, [https://www.registerednursing.org/do-unions-benefit-harm-healthcare-nursing //](https://www.registerednursing.org/do-unions-benefit-harm-healthcare-nursing%20//) LEX JB]

In **spite of overall** union **membership decreasing** in the U.S. **over the past 30 years**, the field of **healthcare has seen a steady increase in representation. Organized labor has targeted the field of healthcare to increase membership dues even in right-to-work states**. As **registered nurses are an important cornerstone of the healthcare industry and provide the preponderance of direct patient care, one must ask the question if unions, or collective bargaining units, are benefiting or harming healthcare**? While many **industries are leaving their union roots in the past as globalization and technological advances outpace the represented worker, nursing union membership is steadily rising. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 20.4% of nurses belonged to a collective bargaining unit, which is significantly higher than the national average of 13.1% across the U.S. Nurses** and **healthcare workers were granted the right to unionize by the National Labor Relations Act nearly 40 years ago, a controversial move considering the "essential" public nature of nurses to provide care in various settings**. Since that time, **numerous labor unions have targeted nurses to unionize under the guise of improving patient outcomes**. There is **no** single **labor union that represents nurses across the nation**. Unions such as Service Employees International Union represent nurses as well as many employee groups such as janitors and airport workers. Unions such as **National Nurses United and state organizations like the California Nurses Association encourage nurses to join as they claim to be nurse-focused.** However, **most of these unions are neither organized nor led by nurses. Many union business representatives are labor lawyers who are unfamiliar with nursing practice or healthcare. This reflection of the leadership can cause the assumption that so-called nursing unions, or those representing nurses, are more interested in the power of membership dues**. Nurses in a collective bargaining unit pay as much as $90 per month for union representation. Given **the number of nurses working in represented organizations, unions are a lucrative business**. The power of having a union negotiate for the nurses can be appealing to many nurses, considering that nurses in union roles are paid 20% higher than nurses in non-union facilities. **However, when a union decides to go on strike, many nurses are faced with losing significant wages during the strike as well as their own personal ethical dilemma of leaving their patients to replacement nurses who are unfamiliar with their patient population. Patient outcomes decline significantly during a nursing strike and the cost to the organization can be detrimental. Organizations have reported losses of over $46 million to train and replace the nurses for large strikes. These costs, even the deaths reported during strikes, are worn like a badge of honor** for some nursing unions who boast of these outcomes to their constituents. Some smaller **community hospitals have had to close their doors to serving their communities, never recovering from the cost of the nursing strike**.

#### Rural hospital closures destroy local economies and communities

**Herman 18** Bob Herman, 5/10/2018 (Health care business reporter) "When a rural hospital shuts down," <https://www.axios.com/when-a-rural-hospital-shuts-down-1525876422-a6074394-91c3-4f96-827d-b008750bb53b.html> ach

**When** rural **hospitals close, their communities** often **lose** their biggest **employers and closest access to health care, struggling to stay afloat in the aftermath**. And that's happening a lot as the health care industry keeps consolidating — 83 rural hospitals have closed since 2010, according to the North Carolina Rural Health Research Program

The impact: This is happening now in rural Missouri, where Community Health Systems is shuttering a 116-bed hospital. Axios spoke with some of the hospital employees who are losing their jobs. They are sad, angry and concerned about what will happen to their community.

Driving the news: CHS said it is "consolidating" the services of the 116-bed Twin Rivers Regional Medical Center in Kennett, Missouri, with another facility 50 miles away. That means Twin Rivers won't deliver babies, have an open emergency room, or offer other inpatient services after July 1. **Roughly 300 people are losing their jobs**.

Kennett is a farming community in Dunklin County, whose residents are poor and have some of the worst health outcomes in the state. (The area overwhelmingly voted for President Trump in 2016.)

Twin Rivers used to be part of Health Management Associates, which CHS acquired in 2014. CHS is mired in debt and other problems, and its CEO has since said he would not have done the HMA deal again.

The company did not respond to a list of questions, including whether it attempted to sell Twin Rivers.

What they're saying: Axios spoke with Twin Rivers employees, who asked to remain anonymous because they said their severance packages require them not to talk to media. They expressed deep frustration and concern for the future.

"That's how they treat us, like we are nothing," a longtime employee said about CHS terminating their positions.

Many people are worried **residents won't get care at all or will suffer from having to drive long distances for hospital care**.

"We have two nursing homes, and people are already talking about pulling their loved ones out because there's not a hospital close enough," another worker said.

"This little town just lost its biggest employer...financially, **a lot of businesses are going to suffer**," an employee said.

## Framing

#### Value morality as ought in the resolution implies a moral obligation.

#### Value criterion is maximizing pleasure and minimizing pain. Prefer it—

**Justification 1: All sensations collapse to pleasure and pain—the logical conclusion is to maximize pleasure and minimize pain.** **Mill:**

The only proof capable of being given that an object is visible, is that people actually see it. The only proof that a sound is audible, is that people hear it: and so of the other sources of our experience. In like manner, I apprehend, **the sole evidence it is possible to produce that anything is desirable, is that people do actually desire it.** If the end which the utilitarian doctrine proposes to itself were not, in theory and in practice, acknowledged to be an end, nothing could ever convince any person that it was so. **No reason can be given why the general happiness is desirable, except that** each person, so far as he believes it to be attainable, desires his own happiness. This, however, being a fact, we have not only all the proof which the case admits of, but all which it is possible to require, that [thus] happiness is a good: that **each person's happiness is a good to that person, and the general happiness, therefore, a good to the aggregate of all persons. Happiness** has made out its title as one of the ends of conduct, and **[is] consequently** one of **the criteria of morality.**

#### Justification 2: Even if other frameworks are good, util is the only framework that’s practical for governments to use.

#### Goodin (Robert E. Goodin. [Philosopher of Political Theory, Public Policy, and Applied Ethics], Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy, Cambridge University Press, 1995. SM)

Consider, first, the argument from necessity. **Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty,** and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private **individuals** will usually **have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and** on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, are relatively poorly informed as to what effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do **know** are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know **what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices**. But that is all. That is **enough [for]** to allow public policy-makers to use **utilitarian calculus** – if they want to use it at all – to chose general rules of conduct. Knowing aggregates and averages, **they can proceed to calculate the utility payoffs** from **[of ]adopting each alternative possible general rule.**

#### Justification 3: Util is a lexical pre-requisite to any other framework: Threats to security and life preclude the ability for moral actors to act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis

### UV

#### 1---1AR theory is skewed towards the aff – a] the 2NR must cover substance and over-cover theory, since they get the collapse and persuasive spin advantage of the 3min 2AR, b] their responses to my counter interp will be new, which means 1AR theory necessitates intervention. C] Timeskew---They get 7/6 time advantage D] Implications – a) reject 1AR theory since it can’t be a legitimate check for abuse, b) drop the arg and reasonability to minimize the chance the round is decided unfairly

#### 2---1AR theory shouldn’t have predetermined paradigm issues---A] punishment should be contextual to abuse – don’t give the death penalty for shoplifting that’s illogical – logic outweighs because it’s a metaconstraint on argumentation B] Incentivizes lots of friv shells that trade off with substance and skew the 2nr time allocation

#### 3---Negating is harder---A] Aff gets infinite prep and neg has to prep for each aff B] first and last word means they have a persuasiveness advantage C] Aff chooses the terms of the debate in the 1ac

#### Presumption and permissibility negate—

#### 1) they haven’t proven a moral obligation which is a distinction from an action being permissible—they must prove the res is permissible not the plan is permissible

#### 2) Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false.

#### 3) the aff is a plan, meaning it is a change from the squo which means no obligation would be negate

#### 4) under a comparative-worlds paradigm it negates since it requires them to prove the statement that “the aff world is more desirable than the neg world”

**Counter – Interpretation:**

**Counter-interp: The negative can read \_\_\_\_\_\_ pics.**

**Standards:**

**1] PICs are key to in depth debate and policymaking education.**

**Branson 07 (Josh Branson, CSIS and graduated from Harvard Law. “Reflections about debate and policymaking” 2007.) IB**

Well, thats not the way it worked at all, at least for me. No doubt in a collegiate debate judged by one of ya’ll I could have killed them all on the Pan K, probably even if we talked slow, but in the real world, **I was** kind of surprised to find that the knowledge generated by debate proved to be fairly damn cursory and artificial. I could rattle off a list of most of the arguments for/against most of the general nonproliferation doctrines, but a lot of the empirical and factual basis for these arguments was completely missing in my brain. I could make the basic claim for almost anything in the field, but the technical issues that underlines a lot of them (the names and locations of the Russian CW destruction plants, an understanding of how the fine points of the budget process works, how a capital market sanction would actually be implemented, where did we get our intelligence that revealed Chinese serial proliferators selling bombs to AQ Khan, how does a centrifuge cascade work and why exactly would multilateral sanctions undermine Irans ability to get uranium gas piping technology, the names of the key players in the various foreign governments that make nonproliferation policy etc) was all missing. Maybe this stuff sounds pretty boring, and some of it is, but this is the type of stuff that really determines whether or not policies are successful and whether or not they are effectively promulgated. But the details pretty much get left out in debates, replaced by a simplistic and power-worded DA that culminates in nuclear winter.’ To my surprise, when setting out in the nonproliferation world, you don’t get to make grand pronouncements about the impact of funding Nunn-Lugar on US soft power or whether funding it would cause a budget deficit which would collapse the global economy and cause multiple scenarios for nuclear war. Instead, most of the work that is done is deciding which and what type of Russian facilities to allocate the money to, knowing the specific people within the Russian government we can trust, which types of nuclear disposition is safest and what types of transportation we should use when moving spent fuel back to storage, etc. When dealing with these discussions repeatedly, I found that debate had provided me a very sound abstract conceptual frame through which to analyze the general issues being raised, but little in a way of meaningfully engaging the policy process. Of course, debaters can learn this language. There are plenty who have. But I’d wonder whether or not people who claim that debate has trained people for this life are mistaking correlation with causation. Two other interesting conclusions: A) To all the people who attack debate for propounding an overly elitist and undemocratic discourse and undermines good broadly appealing public speaking skills: I think you’ve got it backwards. Yes, a lot of debates involve jargon, no question. But at least in my experience, I found that debate provided me the opposite. The times I was most confident at CSIS were when we were doing public debates or discussions in front of unqualified audiences. I could take on even the most senior experts; in these types of forums, I could out debate them and rhetorically counteract their vast experience/knowledge advantage. On the flip side, when I was in conferences with only experts in the field, I often felt at a severe disadvantage. In forums like this, bad arguments get called out, and rhetorically powerful but intellectually flimsy claims are pretty much non-starters. Debate experience wasn’t a ton of help. In terms of research, I did feel that all the debate research I’ve done provided some advantages and gave me a marginal edge over a lot of other people at CSIS, but nothing enormous. Most of the people there, even though they’d never done debate, can research just as well as the average college debater (ESPECIALLY on technical issues). I realize there are problems with the sample size etc, but it made me think twice about the infallible research advantages supposedly generated by policy debate. B) **How to make debate more like the technical policy world? Narrower debates. PICs are vital to this (sorry, Duck). Thinking back on my 8 years in debate, the topic about which I can best converse with experts about is the design of emissions trading schemes. That was because the literature was deep and the prevalence ofupstream/downstream/auctioned/timetable PICs narrowed the debates and forced a real in-depth discussion.** I just don’t think we get that in a ton of debates, because most PICs are either wanky rhetoric PICs (and yes I was an extreme culprit) or something even worse like Consultation. Thinking back on it, I don’t think that the legal topic was worded particularly poorly, I just think that our strategic norms of judging/debating create a lot of problems in generating the type of education a lot of us want. But one of the most striking thing for me about last year’s topic was that I learned more from Repko’s post about his day at the Supreme Court than I did from all the debates I judged combined. In any event, how to create the types of narrow debates that will general real sustainable expertise on topics is tough. I think that we’ve got to learn how to become accepting as a community of analytical smart arguments to answer carded-yet-stupid arguments, maybe start accepting intrinsicness (something that I might post on some other day) as a way to eliminate politics DAs and consultation CPs, and start modifying our theory dispositions to be willing to call out bullshit CPs (see DHeidts new judge philosophy), and finally moving away from the cult of new and surprise arguments (see below). This will also involve changing the way we teach kids as they enter debate; I know I, for one, am going to change the way I teach camp this summer to include at least a little of these thoughts. Of course, the focus must remain on winning above all else, but I think that that pursuit can be synthesized with a change in some of our debate practices. 2. Why an elite or technical discourse is important My second conclusion is directed at people who decry the topic process because it’s too technical, too narrow, drown out the personal or the things that people want to talk about. Again, my opinion is that this is backwards. I think it’s a major problem that more of the people who conduct policy and who are influential in the process are not well-schooled in the actual empirical pragmatic details of the policies that they are advocating. I’ve read a significant amount about Iraq lately, and got to talk to a bunch of people who were intimately involved in the process, and one of the primary problems was that too much of our policy was executed in a cavalier and emotion-laden fashion. The dangerous pursuit of the “liberation of the oppressed” Iraqis at the expense of all the obvious problems entailed with that pursuit, the complete “lack of a plan,” for how to stabilize the country, and an utter ignorance of the technical or real policy issues facing a peacebuilding operation of that magnitude---these are all issues that come up REPEATEDLY when discussing the reason we went into Iraq in such a cavalier and short-sighted manner. A bunch of the more scathing indicts of the topic committee’s work---that the topic is too technical, that it undermines creativity etc…these are traits that for me are reflected in some of the most loathsome policymakers we have. Bush is by all accounts an idiot when it comes to policy expertise, but he’s the president that most people would love to have a beer with, and one who has let his personal conviction guide his policymaking more than any I can remember. His administration appears to conceive of the world in relatively simple generic conceptual dichotomies (stay the course vs. cut and run, terrorists are good or evil, our intelligence is either 100% accurate or its not). Is that really what we want our topics to boil down to? A be nice to the Middle East topic? Because its in the extra 60 words that the real problems with policy are revealed, and its there that we find the difference between an effective invasion that removes a horrible dictator from power and one which kills thousands of people and causes the region to implode. Yeah, you can rail against the elitism and technical nature of a lot of the academic literature all you want, and say that policy debate is exclusionary, but I think that we need more of the elite technical people and fewer of the smoke and mirrors BS artists running things. The policy world could use more Naveens and DHeidts. 3. Qualifications matter. Way more than I thought. My boss this year was the guy who basically ran our proliferation policy under Clinton, and has decades of experience negotiating with foreign officials, of dealing hands-on with our nuclear posture, of having access to intelligence at the highest levels etc. No matter how sweet we debaters think we are at analyzing things, there is a real difference between people like that and those of us who lack that experience. In debate, this guy’s opinion is basically equal to a J.D. Candidate’s. In any other arena, that is a laughable proposition. In debate, by far more important than how credible or qualified your argument is how NEW it is. You surprise the other team with a new strategy (no matter how idiotic) and the chances are good that you will win. Of course, that doesn’t really work in the think tank world. I actually think that debate would be way more educational and realistic if teams were forced to disclose their arguments before hand. I understand all the problems with mandating this, and realize it won’t happen, but I do think that the cult of newness at times is profoundly uneducational. 4. A large percentage of “fairness” impact arguments in debate are stupid. **People’s obsession with “fairness” or “competitive equity” is misguided. One of the most valuable things about debate is adapting to unfair circumstances. If the neg runs conditional CPs, get better and deal with it**. If the aff doesn’t specify their agent, figure out something else besides your same old agent CP. **This is what the policy world is like; you’ve got to react and deal with tough situations. Do I think it’s fair that it’s hard to get published without a graduate degree or personal connections?** Not really. Are most people in the policy community open-minded and unbiased? Nope. **Policymaking is about dealing with unfair and difficult situations, and sometimes debate can be the same way. Looking back, for me a lot of the most intellectually invigorating parts of debate were also the hardest and most “unfair.”** It was unfair that Klinger was so fast and clear, it was unfair that MSU at times read short shitty unpredictable evidence, it was unfair that Fullerton didn’t have a plan and was able to emotionally intimidate judges, it was unfair that a lot of people resented me because I wanted to win and didn't exert much effort socializing at tournaments, it was unfair that some judges were biased and we had to adapt our arguments, and it was unfair that Emory had more card cutters on their team than we did. I’m sure a lot of people feel similar or worse things about debating against Northwestern. **But adapting to this stuff is part of life, and certainly part of the policy world. But in debate we certainly cry foul a lot. Maybe too much.**

**This evidence ow – It s from a real debater who became a policymaker, and says that PICs are key and created portable skills for them in the policy world which outweighs any hypothetical claims by a high school**

**2] Policymaking – Policy makers have discussions about which parts of the plan are desirable and which parts aren’t. If the majority of the plan is good but there is an adjustment that maximizes the potential of the plan a congress man would adjust the bill to benefit the most amount of people. Policymaking outweighs key to education because knowledge is only as useful if it is applicable and influences lives.**

**3] Strategic plan writing – our model forces the affirmative debater to write well researched plans and be familiar with all of the nuances of their affirmative so we cannot read a pic that you can’t answer. Strategic plan writing outweighs since it forces you to become a good advocate for your position and defend why your policy should actually be passed over other policies. If someone can read a Pic that is true, then you should have written a better aff.**

**Education outweighs fairness-a) Portability-no one will care or remember about one instance of in round abuse but educational benefits are portable and can be applied to the real world, b) in your model every debate just turns into a theory debate attempting to create the fairest circumstances possible which causes substance crowd out which outweighs on urgency since we only have 2 months to debate the topic, c) Fairness skews inevitable-some debaters are part of large prep squads with tons of coaches cutting thousands  of cards for them while others don’t have these programs and are at a struct**

#### CI: may contest framing.

**[1] Infinite abuse - they can pick a descriptive standard that would always affirm, which means negs never win o/w their fairness arguments on magnitude**

**[2] Accessibility - conceding frameworks allows for debaters to get away with violent frameworks that potentially justify morally repugnant practices, our model is k2 being able to point it out which o/w because this is a space constitutively designed to include different people by definition, so they void a fundamental structure of debate that comes before gateway issues**

**[3] Phil Ed - we never get any b/c we can never learn how philosophies interact which is important bc debate is about contesting things - o/w phil ed is constitutive because LD Debate is uniquely a values debate**

**[4] Resolvability - no framework debate means we can’t correctly understand the ought part of the resolution meaning we cant coherently debate substance insofar we don’t know if it affirms or negates - o/w because every round needs a winner and loser - their interp forces intervention**

**[5] Strat skew is wrong - [a] turn - its an overcompensation - you get infinite prep to frontline the offense meaning we need the ability to contest the framework to win [b] empirically denied - debaters have won against multiple layers all the time [c] you can just turn the nc - the framework is not necessary for you**

**[6] Affirming is harder is arbitrary - there's no reason as to why you should get the framework even if it is slightly harder to be aff - hold them to a high burden of proof**

**[7] Topic Ed is false - [a] our interp allows debaters to do both - there's no reason why it's impossible to have both debates [b] presumes the neg’s ability to have offense-level prep to**